



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## BOOK REVIEWS AND NOTES.

THE HILPRECHT ANNIVERSARY VOLUME. Studies in Assyriology and Archæology dedicated to Herman V. Hilprecht by his Colleagues, Friends and Admirers. Chicago: The Open Court Publishing Co., 1910. Pp. 450. Cloth, \$5.00.

This volume in honor of the twenty-fifth anniversary of Professor Hilprecht's doctorate and the fiftieth of his birth brings together no less than thirty articles from as many different scholars on the other side of the Atlantic. From Austria, Bohemia, England, France, Germany, Holland, Hungary, Italy, Syria, Sweden, Switzerland, and Turkey, distinguished Assyriologists and archeologists have sent their contributions as free-will offerings. The members of the Committee on Publication, whose names are appended to the Dedication, are Count V. M. de Calry, Lucerne; Prof. L. A. Milani, Florence; Prof. Sir Wm. M. Ramsay, Aberdeen; His Excellency Hamdy Bey, Constantinople; Prince Friedrich Wilhelm zu Ysenburg und Büdingen; E. B. Coxe, Jr., Philadelphia; Dr. Paul Carus, Editor; Prof. D. E. Smith, Columbia University; Prof. G. McClellan, M. D., Jefferson Medical College; and R. Y. Cook, Philadelphia. In order to understand the real significance of the publication of this book we can not avoid referring to the Hilprecht controversy of which we have heard much through the public prints during the last few years. A couple of years ago Professor Hilprecht was most vigorously attacked by some of his colleagues and at his request an investigation was held at the University of Pennsylvania for the purpose of educing the facts in the case. Expert witnesses were invited, some of whom, for reasons satisfactory to themselves we suppose and not difficult for us to imagine, were unable to respond. Others appeared and gave evidence *pro* and *con*. One of the jurors, especially, succeeded in making the unfortunate impression in some quarters that he was acting more or less as counsel for the defendant, an impression that could not do otherwise than detract from the value of the final judgment in the eyes of all who were so impressed. A lengthy and complete account of the examination and findings was published and distributed about two years ago. Professor Hilprecht was exonerated by the court of inquiry; and yet, it appears that the judicial decision left the matter, which was of international notice and comment among Semitists, not much clearer than it was before the investigation began. This was most unfortunate for all concerned, and not only for them, but for the good name of the science of Assyriology, one of the youngest and most difficult, yet one of the highest value culturally of the modern sciences.

The appearance of this volume in Dr. Hilprecht's honor recalls the state-

ment with which the fifth chapter of the First Book of Maccabees opens: "Now when the nations round about heard that the altar was built, and the sanctuary renewed as before, it displeased them very much." Not only are the names of Professor Hilprecht's principal antagonists absent from the Committee on Publication and from the list of contributors, not a single name of a Semitic scholar in the United States is to be found in either, except that of Dr. Hugo Radau of Philadelphia, an excellent and independent scholar, and a devoted friend of Dr. Hilprecht. Nothing could more clearly indicate the dissatisfaction felt by the Professor's colleagues in the department of Semitics in the universities of this country with the method or findings, or with both, of the committee of investigation.

That, doubtless, has contributed to the decision of Semitic scholars on this side of the water not to join with the friends of Dr. Hilprecht on the other side in their loyal expression of appreciation of the service he has rendered in the advancement of Assyriological and archeological research—a service which has been undeniably great, and one to which the Professor has devoted himself with exceptional ardor and self-sacrificing toil, combined with ripe scholarship. Often, in his solution of difficult problems, he has shown a degree of acumen that merits recognition on all sides, and on all sides it ought to be, and, I think, it is, ungrudgingly admitted. But, in addition to their silent protest against what seemed to them the unjudicial proceedings of a university court of adjudication, Semitic scholars in this country have been influenced by their disapproval of methods which they regard as undesirable and even unbecoming in the field of scholarship. If no more serious, they have held them to be, at least, *infra dignitatem*. It has been, to a certain extent, a question of taste, but to some extent also, I think, a question of moral judgment. As regards the latter, Professor Hilprecht denied in his examination that he had at any time intentionally misrepresented any of the facts, although it appeared that statements made in some instances in his writings were liable to lead to incorrect conclusions. But that was not enough. Men forget easily that "charity covereth a multitude of sins," and that most of us cannot afford to advise that the mantle be *taboo*. We should not hesitate about the proper beneficiary of the doubt in a case involving the imputation of *moral* reprehensibility.

The question of bad taste, involved in the charges, is less serious, though in itself often very embarrassing. It is one, moreover, that ought to be judged in the light of general anthropological science and special environment. Egoism is a great fault and many a man's bane. The desire to impress others is universal. Many a man caustic in his criticism of vanity is far removed from exhibiting in his own person and utterances a genuine type of saintly or, to affirm less or more as the case may be, of gentlemanly modesty. It was a distinguished observer who wrote: "It is not only the belle who, by elaborate toilet, polished manners, and numerous accomplishments, strives to make conquests; but the scholar, the historian, the philosopher *use their acquirements to the same end*." Herbert Spencer stated a well-known fact, and one that finds ample and sometimes humiliating verification in the conduct of the best. Men of good family may have bad manners. Kings have misused their authority, and the preachers of the Cross have been known to exaggerate, and state considerably more than the facts warranted. It is by no means a past

vice of the pulpit. Professor Hilprecht's greatest fault, perhaps, is that he is easily tempted in these points, if not in all points, like as they are. His friends have admitted that he has a lively and somewhat exuberant imagination—possibly the Professor would admit it himself were he approached in a manner conducive to subjective analysis.

Granting that there have been exaggerations, even misstatements, in the publications of the excavator of ruined cities concerning the importance of his work, have we ever inquired whether or not the *bacillus americanus* has not been one of the disturbing causes? "The biggest thing on earth" is distinctly occidental in usage and loses something of its significance if not uttered with that attractive nasality that is limited by latitude. Have we never seen university catalogues, almost too big for our waste-paper basket, coming to us with the sound of trumpets, parts of which, we have suspected, would have been placed upon the collegiate *Index expurgatorius* had there been a rigid moral censorship in existence on the campus? Support for Oriental excavations and the study of ancient Oriental literatures make little appeal to the Western mind unless big, or startling, results can be proclaimed. A few thousand tablets will not suffice—we want a whole temple library, if by any means we can have it, and we would like one "bigger" than they have in the British Museum. We would like to have a Babylonian Story of the Creation, or of the Deluge older than the one George Smith discovered in the *Kujundjik* Collection. If any one can promise us such results we can find the money to set a thousand spades at work. But if we ask for money to promote and advance Semitic studies in our universities our only reply may be the smile of ignorant wonder that men of modern times should be interested in the study. Yet, of what use would Assyrian tablets be if we had no students trained in Semitics to read and interpret them? We must be impressive in order to succeed. In addition to his naturally enthusiastic nature may it not be that Professor Hilprecht coming as a foreigner among us and, therefore, in no way immune from the germ, may have had to contend not only with the more harmless inherited Teuton *Enthusiasmus* but also with the more noxious *bacillus Americanus*? In our personal opinion Professor Hilprecht has erred in the use of the "business" advertizing method of overstating, a method, however, which has not been ignored recently by some of our educational institutions, and that is worse. We are further of the opinion that some of the gentlemen active in their opposition to Hilprecht might have found sufficiently large scope for moral reform nearer their own lecture rooms. The feud, however, has been of long standing. It goes back to the beginning of the excavations at Nippur over twenty years ago, when Peters, Hilprecht and Robert Harper were in the field. It has been more or less of a big boys' quarrel from the first, and one which should never have been allowed to attain the dimensions and publicity it has. It was from the first, and still is (for it still goes merrily on in the public prints), one to be settled in our scientific journals, or independent books or brochures, by proof and counter proof, and not by a university court which in such matters is necessarily incompetent, still less by the daily press whose reports are garbled and distorted.

It is not a matter of such immense importance whether the Temple Library was discovered or not. The question we are most interested in is, What new information have the tablets to give us concerning Babylonian civilization?

Neither is it a matter of serious importance to science whether this tablet which Dr. Peters found there is stated by Dr. Hilprecht in one of his books to have been found here. Scientific scholars are not supposed to assume the rôle of moral teachers and trainers. It is their function to refute through the appropriate media, not the columns of the newspapers, false statements of scientific fact or theory by incontrovertible evidence of the contrary. And this should be done calmly and dispassionately, with a zeal only for scientific accuracy.

On the other hand, *every scholar* should recognize the excellent virtue and enhancing as well as becoming grace of modesty. Here, as in religion, posing and *Reklame* are *anathema*.

It must be evident enough from the foregoing that the present writer is not seeking either to condone what are claimed to be scholarly irregularities or to excuse them, but merely to point to conditions among us which, perhaps, may partly help to explain them. The Hilprecht controversy has done no good. It has hurt Hilprecht for *semper aliquid haeret*, but it has not less injured his accusers, the latter perhaps more than they could anticipate. Would it not be best now for both parties to bury the hatchet and forever after keep their peace?

Whatever may be the attitude of American Semitists, one thing is certain, viz., that despite the inability of his American colleagues to join in doing him honor on this occasion, Professor Hilprecht numbers among his friends a distinguished list of names on the other side of the Atlantic. We cannot withhold from him our congratulations that he has his friends, who, whatever their private judgment may be respecting the merits of the discussion, are nevertheless sufficiently in accord to join in presenting to him this handsome attestation of their recognition of his service to Semitic science.

## II.

In taking notice of the contents of the various articles contained in the book we may appropriately turn, in the first place, to the interesting contribution with which the work closes from the pen of Dr. Radau. We notice that the author continues to speak of "The Temple Library" and of "The Older Temple Library" as though the existence of a "Temple Library" had never been questioned, just as Professor Hilprecht has done in previous publications, and as he continues to do in his most recent work (*The Babylonian Expedition of the Univ. of Penn.*, Vol. V. Fasc. 1, "The Earliest Version of the Babylonian Deluge Story and *The Temple Library of Nippur*"). According to Hilprecht more than 50,000 tablets have been unearthed at Nippur by the four Babylonian expeditions of the University of Pennsylvania. In a mound named by the explorers "Tablet Hill," lying to the southwest of the temple of Enlil and separated from it by a narrow strip of land, which Professor Hilprecht thinks indicates the course of an ancient canal, approximately 22,000 tablets were discovered during the four expeditions—the vast majority of them, about 17,500, during the fourth. The sacred ground of the temple-complex in Sippar, Hilprecht points out, was similarly separated by a canal "from the territory of the city proper, where the school and temple library were situated." In a work soon to appear, *Model Texts and Exercises from the Temple School at Nippur*, Hilprecht hopes to present conclusive proof that this large mound

(Tablet Hill) covers the ruins of the Temple Library, School, and part of the archives of the older period. The view adhered to by Hilprecht's opponents is that the character of the documents found, so far as known, does not justify the claim to a discovery of a temple library. Hilprecht described them, in part, in 1896 and later, as syllabaries, letters, chronological lists, historical fragments, astronomical and religious texts, building inscriptions, votive tablets, inventories, tax lists, contracts, etc. On page 8, Vol. V, he now writes "the large quantities of tablets of the Hammurabi period" reported by Peters, (*Nippur*, Vol. II, p. 200) to have been found in 'rooms destroyed by fire' in Tablet Hill. . . . are for the greater part tablets of a *literary* character, not contract tablets." On page 12, *ibid.*, he writes again that about 22,000 of the more than 23,000 tablets obtained from Tablet Hill "belong to the lowest stratum, and with the exception of a few hundred tablets deal with scientific, historical, literary or religious subjects, generally written in Sumerian." It was for this reason, Professor Hilprecht adds, that he designated these ruins as the site of the older Temple Library of Nippur. A fuller description is given on pp. 14 and 15. "The tablets include lists of Cuneiform signs, . . . syllabaries, lists of ideograms, . . . lists of personal proper names, . . . grammatical paradigms and phrases, . . . geographical lists of mountains and countries, lists of gods and temples, of plants, stones and animals, of objects made of wood, leather, etc., professional names, . . . synonym lists of various kinds of words, . . . long lists of weights and of the measures of length, surface, and capacity, . . . lists of months, . . . fragments of chronological lists giving the names of the rulers of dynasties in their successive order. There are medical prescriptions, . . . incantations and exorcisms against evil demons, . . . divination texts and long lists of omens, building inscriptions, historico-religious inscriptions such as elegies, hymns, prayers and other songs. . . . containing frequent allusions to certain kings, hostile invasions and tyrannical oppression by foreign potentates, or liturgical compositions such as New Year and harvest songs." In a footnote, p. 18, we are informed that no less than *six* volumes of Sumerian hymns and prayers addressed to Enlil, Ninib, Tammuz, Sin, Shamash and Ishtar are in course of preparation. Besides these gods, hymns and prayers are addressed to over a dozen more. Yet this, we are informed, does not give us an exhaustive statement of the various classes of scientific and literary texts, but one based solely upon an examination of only about 5000 tablets—not a quarter of the whole, among which are to be found lengthy historical inscriptions.

After reading statements like the foregoing and being in a position to verify them, in part, by the publications referred to, we must admit that they go far towards establishing the claim to a great library. If they do not prove one they go far towards establishing the possession of the principal requisites of one. We cannot make the same demands here that were met in the later and prosperous days of Assyrian rule when especially literary kings were upon the throne and the older libraries of Babylonia were searched for treasures with which to grace the royal library of an Ashurbanipal.

"The greater part of the 'Older Temple Library' has to be assigned," Dr. Radau writes, in confirmation of Hilprecht's statement in B. E., Vol., XX, p. 10, "to the time of the second dynasty of Ur and the first half of the first dynasty of Isin," i. e., about 2700-2400 B. C. Some of the tablets are still older. The dates are definitely established by names of kings belonging to the

dynasties of Ur and Nisin which appear in what the author terms religious-historic texts. Whether Dr. Radau is correct in speaking of the second dynasty of Ur is not a question of importance here. Dr. Radau gives the texts, excellently autographed, transliterated and translated with notes of several Sumerian hymns, and at the end very good photographic reproductions of the tablets follow. Much may be expected from these religious compositions when the texts are all published. Th. Dangin has presented strong arguments in favor of only one dynasty of Ur, although Radau in his *Early Babylonian History* divides its rulers into four dynasties. Four specimens of hymns from this collection are given in transliteration and translation together with copious and valuable notes in which are discussed various questions of great importance to the better understanding of the early Babylonian cults and their relation to each other. The author holds that while all the more important cities of Babylonia had their own temples and ritual, these were but a copy of that of Nippur. The great god Enlil whose worship goes back to 5700 years B. C., and the Nippur trinity are declared to be the prototypes of the great gods and trinities worshiped in Ur, Isin, etc. In anticipation of his forthcoming volumes in which these Sumerian religious documents will be presented, Dr. Radau has added a selection of twenty-three hymns and prayers beautifully autographed and accompanied by half-tone photographic reproductions.

To enter into a discussion of any of the thirty remaining articles is not possible in this notice. They are all meritorious. Ed. Mahler presents a paper on "The Calendar of the Babylonians" in which he shows that the Babylonians in the earliest period of their history had a month of 30 days, while they also had a lunar month alternately of 29 and 30 days. They must, therefore, have also had an *intercalary* system by which the lunar year and solar year were equalized, and this calendrical system implies a *knowledge of astronomy*. The "Platonic number" 12,960,000, which figures in the mathematical tables, published by Hilprecht in 1906, Mahler thinks, in view of the rôle played in the Orient by the number 30, is the product of 30 divine dynasties, each 432,000 years, the period of the 10 kings who ruled from the Creation to the Deluge according to Berossus. It may, therefore, represent the number of years in a world year = 36 divine years, each = 360 divine days, each of which, according to Psalm xc. 4, is equal to 1000 years. Weissbach of Leipsic also presents an article on the calendar, to which is appended a table with the help of which a Babylonian date falling between the years 565 and 506 may be reckoned according to the Julian calendar. Evidently Mahler and Weissbach are not in agreement as to the astronomical knowledge of the early Babylonians, but the latter is a Cartesian in the matter of doubt.—Prásek, University of Prague, writes on the "Beginning of the Persian-Achæmenian Year" and concludes that the Persians adopted the Babylonian method of reckoning the 1st of Nisan as New Years' day, the time of the spring equinox. Professor Hyde of Oxford, in his *Vetaerum Persarum*, etc., 1760, held that the old Persian year began in the spring, but this view has been rejected in recent years by several scholars who place it at the autumnal equinox. A learned article of 36 pages from the pen of Dr. Ball, Oxford, author of *Light from the East*, etc., sets up and seeks to establish the thesis that Sumerian, so far from being an artificial jargon, as Halévy would have us believe, is entitled to be styled *Proto-Semitic*. Daiches, Jews' College, London, follows with a brief and instructive paper on

"*Balaam—a Babylonian Barû.*" The importance of the study of Assyrian in connection with Old Testament study is, as so often, well illustrated in this article. Balaam was not a prophet, but a sorcerer. The story of the episode reveals Babylonian magical elements throughout.—An interesting archeological paper follows from Professor Sayce. A lamp which appears on a boundary stone of the Cassite dynasty (*cir.* 1400 B. C.) as the symbol of the god Nusku, the fire-god, has the name of the god engraven upon it. This is not only of great value in showing the significance of the symbols upon boundary stones (not astronomical, but intended to show what gods were invoked in the protection of the boundaries), but also, that the lamp of the Greeks and Romans came to them from the Babylonians. Homer knows nothing of it. The hall of Ulysses's palace was lighted by *λαμπτήρες* (*lamptēres*), pans of stone or metal. Excavation has failed to produce a Greek or Roman lamp before the seventh century. But at Boghaz Keui M. Chantre discovered in 1894 two bronze lamps of the Babylonian form. From this Hittite center in Asia Minor the lamp, like so much else, was carried by the Phrygian successors of the Hittites to the shores of the Ægean and of Thrace.—C. Fossey, Paris, contributes an article on the "Permutation of Consonants in Sumerian," which may be read with profit in connection with that of Dr. Ball.—M. de Genouillac, Paris, publishes six contract tablets of the dynasty of Ur, and A. de la Fuye discusses the succession of the *patesis* of Lagash from *Entemena* II to *Urukagina* with special reference to *Enetarzi* whom he places immediately after the former, admitting, however, that some uncertainty still exists. *Urukagina*, king of Lagash, Oppert first placed before Ur-nina, and he has been followed by Hilprecht, Radau, and generally by historians relying too much on indecisive paleographical evidence. Heuzey on the same evidence placed him after, and de la Fuye places him fifth from *Entemena*, and, following Nikolski, assigns seven years to *Enlitārzi*.—An interesting pendant to Sayce's article on the lamp as the symbol of the fire god Nusku is found in Dr. Frank's (Leipsic) paper. In it he shows that the plough, called *kankannu* from "the reed-shaped ploughshare," was the symbol of the goddess Geshtinna, the goddess of the plains, and also the scribe of the lower-world. As scribe she was also mistress of the reed (*qanû*). The name, however, can hardly be connected with the shape of the ploughshare as Levy does the Aramaic *qanqan* in his Dictionary and as Frank does here, but much more probably with the hollow receptacle, or drill, which held the grain.—Frank's *Bilder und Symbole* is quoted by Otto Weber in an additional article on "Divine Symbols" found on South-Arabian monuments. Many of these symbols have a mythological significance as in the case of the Babylonian. We question very much, however, whether the author's connection of the *Ziegenkopf* with the Babylonian dragon is correct, and especially the statement that the upper part of the latter has developed out of the harmless "house-goat, and that the South-Arabian monuments show clearly the intermediate stage in the development."—Dr. Alfred Jeremias (Leipsic) finds the key to the explanation of Urim and Thummim in Deut. xxxiii. 8 f. These are cosmic symbols of light and darkness respectively—the upper world and the lower world—the sun as ruler of the former, the moon of the latter. Everything is here reduced to ultimate cosmological-mythological material and motive, and whatever may be said unfavorably to the myth-and-motif interpretation as a universal key to the mysteries and obscurities of ancient Semitic

religion it is often able to make illuminating suggestions. This much, at least, may be predicated of this discussion of *Urim*, *Tummim*, and *Ephod*.

Père Scheil has almost succeeded in being humorous in searching Babylonian literature for a document recording the investiture of some one with official dignity or power—such being suitable, to his thinking, for the occasion. Under the title "*Diplomatica*" he gives, accordingly, text and translation of a small document which states that a certain Zarik is raised to the *patesi*-ship in the presence of ten witnesses; and, on the following page, a similar one recording the appointment of a minister in the name of the king. Unfortunately we learn nothing of importance from the happy idea.—Hommel (Munich) writes on the Babylonian-Assyrian "lists of planets." He several times takes issue with the interpretations and views of Père Kugler. Kugler, by the way, has recently come to the front in an astronomical way, and has denied the knowledge or cultivation of astronomy among the early Babylonians before the seventh century B. C. He has been followed by Boll, who claims that the old Babylonian *Weltanschauung* as set forth by Winckler, Alf. Jeremias and others, rests on "Greek astronomy"! Ed. Meyer, the historian, has also been so far carried adrift, apparently by Kugler's extreme pronouncements, that he has entirely lost his moorings and before the Berlin Academy of Sciences given utterance to statements some of which are wholly inexplicable, as for instance, that "the Library of Assurbanipal is *rein assyrisch, nicht babylonisch*." Had Meyer ever read the Index of Cuneiform Ins. of W. A., or known sufficient Assyrian to read the colophons beginning *kima labirišu šatirma*, he might have been saved from following too rashly in Kugler's footprints. Kugler's latest contribution, "On the Ruins of Pan-Babylonianism," *Anthropos*, IV, 1909, sounds like too triumphant a cry to be sure of itself. In reply to that Hommel writes: "In opposition to that which is there set forth, I hold firmly that the old Chaldeans through their thousands of years of observation must have, and actually did, discover the *Praecession*." In this volume Kugler writes on the number nine among the Babylonians, which he declares to be a sacred symbol. When a city is said to have been destroyed "nine times," that means "completely." This sacred symbolism of numbers goes back to the third millennium, to the time of Gudea in whose inscriptions the goddess Nisaba appears as the one who understands "numbers." The "seal of *Al-Ghazzali*" occurs to me in this connection with its 9 Arabic letters in 3 rows, 3 in each row, and which, when added horizontally, perpendicularly and diagonally, always give the number 15. Its original meaning is unknown, though explanations are not wanting. That the sacredness of 9 is due to its being the product of 3×3 and because 3 itself is sacred, as Kugler says, is doubtless true; but that it represents the divine power "in its completeness in overcoming an inimical power" seems to be a conclusion from the "9 times destroyed" of the text. The 3 doubtless gets its sacredness *first* from the human triad of father-mother-son, which was afterwards applied to the gods. All that was known of the gods was borrowed from human experience and observation. The *Dreiheit* (trinity) is not explained by saying that it is chiefly used of the gods, or of the deity.—Professor Kittel of Leipsic contributes a highly interesting article on "Primitive Rock Altars in Palestine," which is intended mainly to furnish by its excellent photographs of altars a supplement to his *Studien zur hebräischen Archäologie etc.*, 1908.—P. Dhorme (Jerusalem) writes on the Babylonian god '*Nin-Ib*.' Pro-

fessor Clay of the University of Pennsylvania made the discovery in 1907, in connection with his study of the Nippur Collection, that the preceding ideographic writing was read in Aramaic אנשח ('*nwsht*). Clay interpreted this as "En-Martu, lord of the West," Radau as "lord of healing," and several other scholars in other ways. Dhorme regards the *t* as feminine and reads *unash* = *urash* = the name of the god *Ib* of which *Nin-Ib* is the feminine. He identifies this *Nin-Ib* with the god *Nin-gir-su* of Lagash and gives convincing evidence in support of the identification. Myhrman's discussion of an Aramaic text, on one of the clay bowls of Nippur, remains of the Jewish settlers in Babylonia; Boissier's on presages furnished by house insects and the remaining articles are all of great interest and valuable contributions. We fear, however, that the space at our disposal will not permit us to enter into further details regarding the collection. A word or two may, however, be permitted with regard to Professor Hilprecht's recent publication, *The Earliest Version of the Babylonian Deluge Story*. The text is given in autograph and photograph, transliterated and translated. The beginnings of the lines are all broken off. The fragment reads:

1. .... Thee(?)
2. .... I will loosen .....
3. .... all men together it shall sweep away(?)
4. .... before the deluge goeth forth.
5. ....a-ni all there are, verily I shall bring, overthrow, destruction,  
annihilation.
6. ....a great ship                      build                      and
7. ....total height                      let be                      its structure.
8. ....It shall be a house-boat carrying the saved of life.
9. ....roof strong                      roof                      (it).
10. ....(which) thou shalt make
11. ....beasts of the field                      birds of heaven.
12. ....ku um mi                      ni
13. ....and the family
14. .... and .....

The above is the text as it is without Professor Hilprecht's restorations. The following remarks may now be permitted. (1) The fragment is clearly a part of a Babylonian version of the Deluge. (2) With the data available it is impossible to determine its age. Neither the records of the excavations, nor the paleography, nor the linguistic forms, nor all of them together are sufficient to establish for it the age of *Rim-Sin*, or *cir.* 2100, or "surely before 2000 B. C." It is just as possible, and I think more probable, that it belongs to the Cassite period, *cir.* 1700-1130. It may, however, be a copy of a much older original. (3) Hilprecht's restoration of line 12 to .... "[and the creeping things, two of everything] instead of a number" is inadmissible, as well as his translation of "*ku um mi ni*" by "instead of a number." Judging from the photograph which, of course, is not decisive, it seems possible that *ni* may not have to be read with the *mi* at all, and that the *ku-um-mi* may form one word. There remains also the possibility of reading *um-mi-ni* = *ummāni* of the Nineveh version. But the close connection of the *ku* with the next sign and separation from what preceded is against taking it in this way, as the end of a pos-

sible *šûliku* = *šûlik*. Hilprecht's application of the meaning "number" to the Hebrew *min* cannot be justified by Hebrew or Semitic usage. (4) No inferences of any importance to Biblical study, or bearing upon the origin of the Priestly version of the Deluge Story in Genesis can be drawn from this little fragment. Nevertheless the author is to be congratulated upon the discovery of a fragment of a new Deluge Story in the Nippur Collection. It is possible that something may be added to it when the collection is thoroughly examined.

JAMES A. CRAIG.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN, JUNE, 1910.

---

MATTER AND MEMORY. By *Henri Bergson*. Authorized Translation by *Nancy Margaret Paul* and *W. Scott Palmer*. London: Sonnenschein, 1911. Pp. 339. Price, 10s. 6d. net.

Henri Bergson, a member of the Institute and professor at the College of France, is broadly before the public, and he proposes a philosophy which is strongly opposed to the traditional views. He claims that science is not and ought not to be monistic, and will naturally be considered as reactionary by scientists as well as monistic thinkers. His book on *Matter and Memory* fairly characterizes the trend of Bergson's thought, and considering that fact and his significance at the present day, we will quote a number of passages which indicate both his arguments and conclusions.

He says:

"This book affirms the reality of spirit and the reality of matter, and tries to determine the relation of the one to the other by the study of a definite example, that of memory. It is, then, frankly dualistic. But, on the other hand, it deals with body and mind in such a way as, we hope, to lessen greatly, if not to overcome, the theoretical difficulties which have beset dualism.... Realism and idealism both go too far, [and] it is a mistake to reduce matter to the perception which we have of it, a mistake also to make of it a thing able to produce in us perceptions, but in itself of another nature than they. Matter, in our view, is an aggregate of 'images.' And by 'image' we mean a certain existence which is more than that which the idealist calls a *representation*, but less than that which the realist calls a *thing*,—an existence placed half-way between the 'thing' and the 'representation.'"

Bergson's idea of matter differs from common usage as is seen from the following quotation:

"Pure perception, which is the lowest degree of mind,—mind without memory—is really part of matter, as we understand matter. We may go further: memory does not intervene as a function of which matter has no presentiment and which it does not imitate in its own way."

The argument of the whole book hinges upon an explanation of memory as distinguished from perception. Between the two is the function of sensory image. On page 170 he says:

"Perception is never a mere contact of the mind with the object present; it is impregnated with memory-images which complete it as they interpret it. The memory-image, in its turn, partakes of the 'pure memory,' which it begins to materialize, and of the perception in which it tends to embody itself: